

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/686,308	10/15/2003	Gilles Festeau	TMP-2043	8252
75	590 06/03/2005		EXAM	INER
Patrick J. Viccaro, Esq.			FRIDIE JR, WILLMON	
Allegheny Tech	nnologies Incorporated			
1000 Six PPG F	Place		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
Pittsburgh, PA	15222-5479		3722	
			DATE MAIL ED: 06/03/2009	• •

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				W		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	110		
Office Action Summary		10/686,308	FESTEAU ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Willmon Fridie	3722			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. In SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ware to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a within the statutory minimum of thi rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Fe	ebruary 2005.				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.				
3) 🗌	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.[D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-12 and 14-27</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.				
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-12 and 14-27</u> is/are rejected.					
· 7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.	•			
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) 🔲 objected to	by the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	ion is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priorical application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in A ity documents have beer I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage			

Attachment(s)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5,9-11,14-19 and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Waggle.

Waggle discloses all of the subject matter as set forth in the claims and is identical to the invention as broadly recited. Some of the claimed elements clearly disclosed by the reference are: a top (22), a bottom (14), a chip breaking geometry (12), conical clearing surfaces (12a) and four convex cutting edges (18) including minute straight line segments formed with nose corners (20). Further Waggle discloses at column 3, lines 20-24 the use of a hole between the top and bottom surface which is equivalent to the claimed conical clearance surface.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 6-8, 12 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waggle.

In regard to claims 6-8 and 20-22, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use the claimed dimensions, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 05 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

In regard to claim 12, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the different portions of the convex cutting edges of whatever form or shape was desired or expedient. A change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent any showing of unexpected results. *In re Dailey et al.*, 149 USPQ 47.

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's arguments that Waggle does not disclose the a conical clearing surface adjacent to one of the convex cutting edges, the examiner directs applicant's attention to column 3, lines 33-40 which discuss the conical clearance

Art Unit: 3722

surface (12a) of Waggle. It is clear that a conical shape on the surface (12a) would produce a topography having a relief or depression that would inherently form a clearance. Hence Waggle discloses all of the subject matter as set forth in the claims at issue and is identical to the invention as broadly recited.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Willmon Fridie Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-4476. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 9-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrea Wellington can be reached on 571-272-4483. The fax phone

Art Unit: 3722

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

wf

WILLMOŇ FRIDIE, JR. PRIMARY EXAMINER Page 5